



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,035	06/23/2003	Mizuo Miyazaki	CPR-00101.P.1-US	9541
24232	7590	12/13/2005	EXAMINER	
DAVID R PRESTON & ASSOCIATES APC 12625 HIGH BLUFF DRIVE SUITE 205 SAN DIEGO, CA 92130			AUDET, MAURY A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1654	

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/602,035

Applicant(s)

MIYAZAKI, MIZUO

Examiner

Maury Audet

Art Unit

1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06/23/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.142, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

I. Claims 1-32, drawn to methods for preventing or reducing adhesion formation between tissue surfaces, anytime or postoperatively, in a vertebrate subject comprising AT LEAST ONE protease inhibitor or a COMBINATION of at least one protease inhibitor AND a delivery vehicle which maintains an effective local concentration of said protease inhibitor, classified in class 514, subclass 18.

II. Claims 33-34, drawn to composition comprising AT LEAST ONE protease inhibitor or a COMBINATION of at least one protease inhibitor AND a delivery vehicle which maintains an effective local concentration of said protease inhibitor, classified in class 530, subclass 331.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use, respectively. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the methods may be practiced by a myriad of compositions

Art Unit: 1654

comprising any peptide or compound that functions as a protease inhibitor(s) or a myriad of compositions comprising a combination of any protease inhibitor(s) and delivery vehicle which maintains an effective local concentration of said protease inhibitor; any of which have different structure/effect.

The several inventions above are independent and distinct, each from the other. They have acquired a separate status in the art as a separate subject for inventive effect and require independent searches. The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the literature search. Further, a reference, which would anticipate the invention of one group, would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious another group. Finally, the consideration for patentability is different in each case. Thus, it would be an undue burden to examine all of the above inventions in one application. Restriction for examination purposes is therefore proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Requirement for Peptide or Compound Election

The present invention is drawn to a composition or method of using ANY peptide/compound that functions as a protease inhibitor. In addition to term searching the method itself (reducing adhesion formation between tissues), a compound/sequence (NOT TERM) search of the peptides/compounds must also be conducted. However, some or all of the

Art Unit: 1654

peptides/ compounds do not contain a substantial, distinguishable core structure/sequence that runs through them respectively. Thus, an overlapping/coextensive search of the peptides/compounds is not possible. Therefore, an individual sequence and/or structure search is required of each peptide/compound claimed alongside a term search in this method of use (reducing adhesion formation between tissues). Thus, an undue search burden exists. Therefore, irrespective of which Group is elected as the invention, Applicant is required to elect a single peptide/compound to the invention will be examined on the merits as drawn to (such as the only protease inhibitor specifically claimed (see claims 6-10 and 20-24, 3-mer peptide "Suc-Val-Pro-Phe⁴(Oph)₂" or "Suc-Val-Pro-Phe⁴(Oph)₂-A") and appearing to be enabled (see page 24 of specification showing enablement problems of even closely related compounds: "Subsequent experiments in this animal model using enantiomerically enriched preparations of Suc-Val-Pro-Phe⁴(Oph)₂ demonstrated that the enriched Suc-Val-Pro-Phe⁴(Oph)₂-A, but not enantiomer Suc-Val-Pro-Phe⁴(Oph)₂-I resulted in a significant preventative effect, reducing adhesion formation"). **This requirement is not to be taken as an election of species, but rather as an election of a single invention, since each compound is assumed to be a patentably distinct invention, in the absence of evidence to the contrary.**

Species Election

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: any delivery vehicle which maintains an effective local concentration of said protease inhibitor. Applicant must elect a single species of any such delivery vehicle for which support is present. For instance, Applicant further claims delivery vehicle subgenera of:

Art Unit: 1654

films (claims 27-28; e.g. PACA), liposomes (claim 29, no specific one listed, must elect a specific one); and a high-molecular weight carrier (claim 30, e.g. dextran). To effectuate the species election, Applicant would, for instance, have to elect a specific species from one of such subgenera, e.g. PACA.

Thus, if either Group I or II is elected as the invention (combination inventions including delivery vehicles), Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 16, and 33 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1654

In re Ochiai/Brouwer Rejoinder

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.** Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 1654

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maury Audet whose telephone number is 571-272-0960. The examiner can normally be reached from 7:00 AM – 5:30 PM, off Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached at 571-272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197.

MA, 12/03/2005

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Bruce Campell". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**BRUCE R. CAMPPELL, PH.D
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600**